



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

This passage is a good example of the changes often made by Langlande in the same passage in his several revisions, even when he made no additions. It is interesting to note that after using 'dore-tre,' he returned to 'dore-nayle,' in which form the proverb, even older than Langlande's work, has remained to the present day.¹

In the passages from Gower, 'that for' should be 'for that' (p. 270); after line 3 (p. 271) two lines are omitted without any indication of the omission; in line 4 'to' should be erased; in line 6 'love' should be 'lore'; and in line 8 'what' should be 'that.' These too may seem small matters, but they show a lack of care in proof-reading and are worrying to one who wants the text as it stands in the printed editions. Pauli's text of Gower is in great need of revision, but until some editor arises to take it in hand, we shall have to use it as it stands. On p. 280, line 1, we find 'Peacock' for 'Pecock,' and on p. 299, 'Tyndale and Latimer were boys in their teens as Caxton came to the year of his death.' Caxton died about 1492 (some say 1491), when 'Tyndale was eight years, and Latimer one year of age. The selection from Latimer is printed continuously, although there are several omissions of passages. Also, Latimer writes 'plough' and 'ploughman,' not 'plow' and 'plowman.' John Randolph, writing in 1806, corrects his nephew for spelling 'plowing' (Letters, pp. 10 and 17). As regards the statement on p. 318, it may be noted that Tyndale began to print at Cologne, but was discovered and forced to fly to Worms, where he finished his first edition. On p. 319 we find 'Vilvond' for 'Vilvoorde,' on p. 323 'Membert' for 'Mombert,' and on p. 339 'Tully's Officers' for 'Offices.' Note also 'Roger's' (p. 349), 'Brookes' (p. 365), 'precedure' (p. 367), *sev* for *seo* (p. 376), and a few other misprints in the 'Reference List.' It is not possible to avoid misprints, and some must be condoned in every book, but this book has an unusually large number of them; they are noted for future correction.

Professor Hunt writes in an easy and interesting style, and no fault is to be found with his criticisms as such. The faults noted can easily be corrected in a future edition, and, in the opinion of the writer, the book will thereby be made more serviceable. Literary criticism should be based on philological accuracy, and oversights should be duly corrected. Professor Hunt has made plain to the general reader the pervading ethical teaching in Old and Middle English literature, and I trust his book may reach a wide circle of readers and may awaken a desire for more extended acquaintance with that literature.

JAMES M. GARNETT.

The English Language and English Grammar, an historical study of the sources, development and analogies of the language and of the principles governing its usages, illustrated by copious examples from writers of all periods. By SAMUEL RAMSEY. G. P. Putnam's Sons, New York and London, 1892. iv + 571 pp.

This is a comprehensive title, and had the book fulfilled its promise with like thoroughness throughout, it would have been a valuable work. As it is, the work seems to the writer a prominent illustration of the impossibility of

¹ Cf. Amer. Jour. of Philology, VIII 347 ff. (No. 31, Oct. 1887), for review of Langlande's work.

writing about the English language without a competent knowledge of its older periods. It is when treating these periods that the defects of the book are most plainly seen. The author writes in an easy, pointed and interesting style, and his remarks upon present usage are judicious, and can generally be concurred in, but he is not a good guide for the older language.

The work is divided into two parts, the first, of over 200 pages, treating the English Language, and the second, of over 300 pages, treating English Grammar. The subjects of the several chapters of the first part are, the instability of language, the sources of English, the province of grammar, word-making, the alphabet, Grimm's Law, and pronunciation and spelling. The second part treats the several parts of speech, and syntax, closing with some suggestions to young writers, which it would be well for young writers to follow. The weakness of the work is seen in the very first chapter, in the misprints of the specimens of Old English, especially of Caedmon's Hymn (p. 8), in which there are no less than *eight* palpable errors, besides the omission of one and a half lines at the end, which are necessary to the sense, and the hymn itself is mistranslated, *or astelidae* being rendered "from the beginning"; no regard is paid to its punctuation.

The chapter on the sources of English is very inadequate. The author has no conception of Old English phonology, or of dialectic variations. All that he has to say of *ea* and *eo* is that they were "especial favorites, in which the sounds are supposed to have been kept separate" (p. 13); he has no notion of the circumstances under which they occur. So in a list of words given to show that these words "from the Lindisfarne Gospels, A. D. 950, are nearer modern English than the Saxon of the same period," we find "Saxon *axode*, Anglian *ascade*," with no mention of the West Saxon *ascode*, weakened to Southern English *askede*; similarly "Saxon *fixas*, Anglian *fiscas*," overlooking the common *fiscas*¹; *ex uno disce omnes*. Again, p. 20, it is scarcely correct to say that "A monk named Ormin composed a long poem on the Jewish and Christian religions," when he was merely writing a poetical paraphrase of the readings in the Church service, with homiletic explanations and additions.

On p. 23 we find the wonderful statement that "The earliest English poetry depended neither on rhyme, accent, nor measure, but on alliteration." One who could make such a statement must either have no ear for *accent* or be ignorant of the earliest English poetry. Our author still puts the English version of Sir John Mandeville's 'Travels' as 1356 (p. 39), not having examined the Encyclopedia Britannica volume of 1882, where this date is duly corrected. This chapter is, however, more noticeable for its omissions than its inclusions. We have no original and thorough study of the Anglo-Saxon (Old English) basis of the language, and its successive modifications by Scandinavian, Norman-French, Latin and Greek elements. The author has made use of Professor Skeat's Etymological Dictionary, and takes some statistics of the distribution of words from it, but the 'dictionary' method is a very erroneous one for ascertaining the proportion of words of different origin in actual use. On p. 36 Mr. Ramsey gives the estimates of Hickes, Sharon Turner, Trench and Thommerel, but omits the later and better one of Hon. George P. Marsh,

¹ Presumably these words are taken from Matt. 14, 17, but here the Rushworth MS has *fiscas*.

although his name is mentioned on p. 27. It may be remarked in passing that it is not now usual to refer to the late Archbishop of Dublin as *Dean* Trench. After some remarks on the province of grammar, which the author rightly regards as "a purely descriptive science," the duty of the grammarian being "to state and classify the facts as he finds them," we have a long chapter on Word-Making. Here, along with lists of prefixés and suffixes found in English words, we have illustrations from Turkish, after Max Müller, and paradigms from Semitic languages, Hebrew and Arabic, that seem out of place and might well have been omitted. On p. 57 the so-called "successive amputations" of the Old English *daeghwamlican* are purely imaginary, and it would be difficult to substantiate such forms as are there given: the author mixes a supposed M. E. *dae-* with an O. E. *-lic*, and regards it as but a shortened form of the former word: Stratmann would have helped him out here. The Shaksperian *godigoden* (R. and J. iii, 5 [not 2, as given], 173) is cited as an illustration of the running together of a phrase into a word, but the fuller *godgigoden* (i, 2, 58), in which the *g* is retained, is omitted; the former may be a misprint, as the First Folio is notoriously full of misprints. It would be well to drop Max Müller's comprehensive term 'Turanian' (p. 81), and not to classify Basque with the Finno-Tataric languages merely because it is agglutinative. (Cf. Hovelacque, *Science of Language*, pp. 144-6 and 109 ff.) On p. 87, *ad fin.*, we find *sothe* as a preterite of *seethe*, and p. 89, *ad fin.*, the Scotch *gaed* given as the preterite of *go*, i. e. M. E. *yode*, A. S. *ēode*, with which it has no connection. On p. 92 we find 'Country-dance, for contra-dance,' after Webster, i. e. through French *contredanse*. The reverse would be more nearly correct, and Professor Skeat states that "*country-dance* is not the same as *contredanse*." This is an instance of mistaken etymology.

The chapter on The Alphabet gives some useful information as to the origin of the characters, tracing them back to the early Greek, old Hebrew, and Egyptian, though at somewhat disproportionate length. The author thinks (p. 122) that *thorn* (þ) and crossed *d* (ð) represented respectively the surd and the sonant sounds of *th*, an erroneous notion, as these characters were used indifferently for both sounds. The short chapter on Grimm's Law is very unsatisfactory, and we hear nothing of Verner's Law. Pronunciation and Spelling are treated at considerable length and more satisfactorily. The author has evidently devoted much study to these subjects, and has given us a full treatment of them from a popular and practical point of view. He has made no attempt at a scientific classification of sounds, nor has he adopted the usual key to pronunciation, as in the New English Dictionary, for example, but a system of his own, which is easily understood, and, in general, consistently carried out; (*ai*), for instance, is used to represent the name-sound of *a*, as in *fain*, *fane*, and (*ii*) the diphthongal sound of *i* in *fine*. *Ei* (p. 156) represented this latter sound "for more than three hundred years," says the author; it then passed into (*ae' ee*), and "toward the close of the seventeenth century" into the sound (*ai*). "The eighteenth century made the digraph what it is now prevailing (*ee*)," as in *deceive*. It is hard to say what pronunciation Mr. Ramsey gives to *heifer*, but it seems to be the long *e* (*ee*), as above, and not the short *e* (*hēf-er*), which is now more common. It deserves to be noted that he rightly recognizes the pronunciation of chair as *cheer*, oblige as

obleej, as correct in the last century and continued by old persons into the present century. So also of *oi* as (*ii*), *piint* for point, *jiin* for join, which may be substantiated from Pope's poetry. The writer has often heard these pronunciations from older, well-educated persons. Mr. Ramsey rightly says: "they are merely old-fashioned" (p. 166). He frequently gives provincial and colloquial pronunciations, as 'Virginian kyard, gyarden,'¹ cited (p. 152) as an instance of palatalization, which was formerly so prevalent in Old English. He has omitted, however, the colloquial *yō* for ewe; I have never heard a country farmer, even an educated man, use any other pronunciation, although the dictionaries are unanimous for *yu*. I do not think the author rightly discriminates the *i*-sounds in *fire* and *fine* (p. 161). The diphthongal *i* is, to my ear, the same in both, i. e. as in the pronoun *I* and the noun *eye*, but the former is followed by the *ɜ*-sound, i. e. *u* in *but*, due to the following *r*, which so often makes a dissyllable in Shakspeare. But comment on sounds is infinite, and space is finite, so there must be an end to these remarks. On proper names (pp. 202-5) I may simply say that in this latitude *Le-fee'-vur* is heard for Lefevre, as well as the French pronunciation, *Mooltree* for Moultrie, *l* being retained, and *Tol-i-ver*, not *Tul-i-ver*, is the pronunciation of Taliaferro. The chapter closes with some judicious remarks on phonetic spelling, which is, however, as far off as ever, except for scientific purposes.

There is no space to comment in detail upon the second part. It may be remarked, in general, that where the author steers clear of the older language, there is little fault to find, but here, as in the first part, he is all at sea. Some of these errors will be briefly noted: on p. 239 occurs the statement: "In Anglo-Saxon *child* and *children* were alike *cild*." It should be unnecessary to state that the plural of *cild* was *cildru*, although *cild* is used as a plural in the passage cited (Matt. ii. 16). From *cildru* came M. E. *childre* and *childer*, the latter still heard in the North of England, and to these forms *n* was added in Southern English, making the double plurals *children* and *childern*, of which the former survived. On p. 242, *fit*, *gfs*, *ti'8* are not the plurals of *fōt*, *gōs*, *tō8*. The phenomena of mutation (Umlaut) do not seem to be understood by the author, and certainly *child*, *children* (p. 244) is not an example of it. It is certainly wrong to include *leman* with *horseman*, etc., as forming plurals in *-men* (cf. *Piers Plowman*, A. 3, 146 et al.). We have been saying *lemans* since the fourteenth century, though Stratmann gives *lefmen* from Robert of Gloucester, circa 1297. On p. 294 the paradigm of the weak (definite) declension of the A. S. *gōd* is given, although the author says: "The Saxon declension took another pattern slightly fuller when the definite article preceded the adjective" (!), a singular instance of misconception. The strong (indefinite) declension had been given for *blind* under Word-Making (p. 88), where it was not needed, but it would have been in place here. On p. 310 we find *wet* for we two, and on p. 315 the first example, from 'The Soul's Ward,' is mistranslated. But I must pass over much noted for comment. On p. 352 the author shows an entire misconception of the reason for Grimm's use of the terms *strong* and *weak* to denote the Teutonic conjugations, but I have no room for quotation. As to the basis of the classification of the strong verbs he has not the most remote idea, nor of the change of vowel in the

¹ This is given as an alternative pronunciation by Cooley (1863).

preterite singular and plural. I know of no one since Chaucer who holds "that we ought to say *he sang* and *they sung*." In his list of *strong* verbs such *weak* verbs as *bleed*, *lead*, *read*, etc., are included simply because the modern preterite shortens the vowel, and even *plead*, of Norman-French origin, is inserted and furnished in due form with a preterite and participle *pled* (!), thus elevating this illiterate form to the society of the literate. But I must bring this review to a close, and cannot notice the succeeding chapters. Suffice it to say that there are many more errors when dealing with Gothic and Anglo-Saxon forms. Bosworth has supplied the quotations from the Gospels, but he is often quoted incorrectly. Gothic forms beginning with *hw* are repeatedly written *wh*, and there are other errors in Gothic words. In one short line from John xiii. 14 (p. 379) there are three errors in the Anglo-Saxon: the A. S. *sceolon* is written *sceolen*, *eower* is omitted, and *ðres* is written *others*. I am inclined to sympathize with Mr. Ramsey's hostility to the puristic rules about the use of *shall* and *will*, which are the inventions of modern English grammarians. It may be remembered that Mr. Marsh declared against them and predicted their speedy disappearance from the language: they certainly have no historical support, as every reader of the Bible can learn for himself. I must, in closing, call attention to the remarkable paradigm of *fand*, preterite of *findan*, on p. 445, and the remarks following on p. 446, and to the form *secege* for the imperative on p. 458. There are several errors in the quotations on p. 491, as a comparison with Morris and Skeat's Specimens, Part I, which has furnished them, will show. In the very first one *liefē* is written for *lufe*, and the word *muſestoch* (mouse-trap) is left off, which materially affects the sense, causing the author to turn a genitive into an impossible plural. Mr. Ramsey has copiously illustrated his remarks with examples, the only correct method, but he should quote accurately, *verbatim et literatim*; otherwise, he runs the risk of gross errors. Again, on p. 498, a lack of knowledge of Anglo-Saxon has led him to turn a plural into a singular in Gen. xxxii. 11. The quotations from Chaucer also need looking after on pp. 496 and 531, for the rhythm is sadly mutilated. On p. 522 the author rightly condemns the placing of an adverb between *to* and the infinitive, but I fear it is hopeless to fight against this blunder, which is gradually becoming more and more common where least expected. He also condemns the solecism *of all others* (p. 547), which, however, was more common in the Elizabethan period than now.

If the historical part of the book could be rewritten, it would be improved: as it stands, it is a blind leader of the blind.

JAMES M. GARNETT.

Ueber den Ursprung des Substantivsatzes mit Relativpartikeln im Griechischen. Von Dr. PETER SCHMITT. Beiträge zur historischen Syntax der griechischen Sprache. Herausg. von M. Schanz. Band III, Heft 2. Würzburg, A. Stuber's Verlagshandlung, 1889.

The practical interest in Schmitt's book, *Ueber den Ursprung des Substantivsatzes mit Relativpartikeln im Griechischen*, which appeared in 1889, was very much lessened by the fact that soon after its publication the main results were assimilated by Professor Goodwin in his new Moods and Tenses, which came